

REMARKS

Enclosed herewith is a Substitute Specification in which the specification as filed has been amended in various places to correct typographical and grammatical errors. In addition, the specification as filed has been amended on page 6 to cite U.S. Patent 6,782,253 corresponding to the cited U.S. application. Enclosed herewith is form PTO/SB/08A listing this U.S. patent.

In support of the above, enclosed herewith is a copy of the specification as filed marked up with the above changes.

The undersigned attorney asserts that no new matter has been incorporated into the Substitute Specification.

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, claims 1, 5, 6, 8-18 and 20 have been cancelled, while claims 3, 7 and 19 have each been made proper independent claims including the limitations of the parent claim and any intervening claims. In addition, claims 2 and 4 have now been made dependent on claim 3. Finally, the claims have been amended for clarity.

In view of the cancellation of claims 8 and 9, Applicants believe that this application is properly designated as a continuation of prior co-pending U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/823,460 (Applicants refer the Examiner to the opening paragraph of the Substitute Specification denoted "CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS").

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/823,460.


Enclosed herewith is a Terminal Disclaimer referencing said co-pending U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/823,460.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 1, 2, 4-6, 10-16 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,969,697 to Tani et al. In addition, the Examiner has rejected claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tani et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,917,362 to Pinedo et al. Finally, the Examiner has rejected claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tani et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,818,425 to Want et al. Applicants acknowledge that the Examiner has found claims 3, 7 and 19 allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a) rejections have been overcome, and that claims 2-4, 7 and 19 should now be allowed.

Applicants believe that this application, containing claims 2-4, 7 and 19, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by 
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613
Attorney
Tel.: 914-333-9611

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

It is hereby certified that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First-class mail in an envelope addressed to:

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

On January 31, 2006
By Barnett James